



PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Docket No: Q60517

Hisashi ISHIKURA, et al.

Appln. No.: 09/649,097

Group Art Unit: 2635

Confirmation No.: 7802

Examiner: Nguyen, Nam V

Filed: August 28, 2000

For: VEHICLE KEY SYSTEM

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Please review and enter the following remarks summarizing the Examiner interview:

REMARKS

During the interview, the following was discussed:

1. Brief description of exhibits or demonstration: None
2. Identification of claims discussed: Claims 1 and 20
3. Identification of art discussed: None
4. Identification of principal proposed amendments: None
5. Brief Identification of principal arguments:

Applicants' representatives contacted the Examiner to conduct an interview because it was not clear why claim 20, and not claim 1, is indicated as being allowed in the Office Action dated September 8, 2004. That is, in the Office Action, the Examiner recites particular features of claim 20 as being the reasons why this claim is allowed, however the recited features are also recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicants' representatives were not sure why claim 20 is allowed and claim 1 is rejected. The Examiner clarified his statement of reasons for allowance

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW
U. S. Application No. 09/649,097

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q60517

and stated that claim 20 is allowed because claim 20 recites that only "both the fingerprint information and system-specific identifier" are transmitted from the transmitting means. Independent claim 1 recites that "only the fingerprint information captured by said fingerprint information capturing means, only a system-specific identifier previously stored in said identifier storage means, or both the fingerprint information and the system-specific identifier" are transmitted from the transmitting means. In other words, the Examiner finds that transmitting "both" items of information is patentable, whereas transmission of only one of the items of information is not.

6. Indication of other pertinent matters discussed: None

7. Results of Interview: Examiner's clarification reported to Applicants.

It is respectfully submitted that the instant STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW complies with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §§1.2 and 1.133 and MPEP §713.04.

It is believed that no petition or fee is required. However, if the USPTO deems otherwise, Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee, except for the Issue Fee, for such extension is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,



Diallo T. Crenshaw
Registration No. 52,778

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 8, 2004